

REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

I. Amendments to the Claims

Claims 1 and 9 have been amended to clarify features of the invention recited therein and to further distinguish the present invention from the references relied upon in the rejections discussed below.

II. 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph Rejection

Claims 1 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for failing to comply with the written description requirement. Specifically, the rejection states that claims 1 and 9 recite that the “judgment unit/step repeats the judgment by comparing the display judgment information having the hierarchical format and the device-related information having the hierarchical format, starting from a higher layer of the hierarchical format of the display judgment information and continuing to a lower layer of the hierarchical format of the display judgment information,” which is allegedly not described in the specification. This rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

The Applicants note that the above-mentioned limitations of claims 1 and 9 are supported by paragraph [0040] and Fig. 22 of the originally filed specification. In particular, the Applicants note that paragraph [0040] states that “FIG. 22 shows an example of the information recorded in the recording unit 104 of the television 201. The information is described in the recording unit 104 in a hierarchical fashion as follows, for example: information used to compare device types

is described first; information used to compare device information of each device type and to compare service information of each device are described next; and information used to compare function information, which is the details about the service information, is described next.”

This above-mentioned disclosure of the present application fully describes the claimed repeating of the judgment, as required by amended claims 1 and 9. Specifically, the Applicants note that the hierarchical structure described in paragraph [0040] and Fig. 22 inherently indicates that the judgment should be carried out for the various elements of the hierarchical structure. As such, the judgment must be repeated in order to carry out the comparing of each element of the structure. In view of the above, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

III. 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections

Claims 1, 5-9, 13-16 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Beecroft (U.S. 6,760,415), Choi (U.S. 2004/0150546), Takahashi (EP 1 028 368), Humpleman (U.S. 2010/0070868) and Mitra (U.S. 7,412,701). Further, claims 4 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Beecroft, Choi, Takahashi, Hiroyuki (EP 1028368), Humpleman, Mitra and Castaldi (U.S. 2005/0005109). These rejections are believed clearly inapplicable to amended independent claims 1 and 9 and the claims that depend therefrom for the following reasons.

Amended independent claim 1 recites a display apparatus including a display unit operable to display device-related information (related to a device connected to a network), when a judgment unit judges that the device-related information is identified in display judgment information (recorded in a recording unit of the display apparatus and indicating whether information should be displayed on a screen). Further, claim 1 recites that the device-related

information is in a hierarchical format, and recites that the display judgment information includes (in a hierarchical format) (i) pieces of device type information, each piece of the device type information identifying a type of a device connected to the network, and (ii) pieces of device information, each piece of the device information identifying information about the device for which the type is identified by a corresponding piece of the device type information. In addition, claim 1 recites that the judgment unit repeats the judgment on the device-type information and the display judgment information having the hierarchical format, starting from a higher layer of the hierarchical format of the display judgment information and continuing to a lower layer of the hierarchical format of the display judgment information. Finally, claim 1 recites that the judgment unit judges, in the higher layer of the display judgment information, whether or not the device-related information is identified in the display judgment information, such that, when the device-related information is judged by the judgment unit to be identified in the higher layer of the hierarchical format of the display judgment information, the judgment unit judges, in the lower layer of the hierarchical format of the display judgment information, whether or not the device-related information is identified in the display judgment information.

Initially, please note that the above-described 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection relies on Figs. 4-6 and paragraphs [0061]-[0064] of Humpleman for teaching the features of the judgment performed by the judgment unit, as recited in previously presented claim 1 (see pages 12-14 of Office Action). However, in view of the above-identified amendments to claim 1, which clarify the structure required by the judgment performed by the judgment unit, it is submitted that any combination of Humpleman, Beecroft, Choi, Takahashi and Mitra fails to disclose or suggest the above-mentioned distinguishing features now required by amended independent claim 1.

Rather table 2, as disclosed in paragraph [0061] of Humpleman, merely teaches storing data of a single device in a non-hierarchical manner.

Thus, in view of the above, it is clear that Humpleman teaches that data of a single device is stored in a non-hierarchical manner, but fails to disclose or suggest that the judgment unit repeats the judgment on the device-type information and the display judgment information (wherein each of pieces of information identify a type of device) having the hierarchical format, starting from a higher layer of the hierarchical format of the display judgment information and continuing to a lower layer of the hierarchical format of the display judgment information, wherein the judgment unit judges, in the higher layer of the display judgment information, whether or not the device-related information is identified in the display judgment information, such that, when the device-related information is judged by the judgment unit to be identified in the higher layer of the hierarchical format of the display judgment information, the judgment unit judges, in the lower layer of the hierarchical format of the display judgment information, whether or not the device-related information is identified in the display judgment information.

In other words, the non-hierarchical use of data, as illustrated in table 2 of Humpleman, is completely different from the complex hierarchical structure required by claim 1, such that the judgment unit performs a judgment based on the higher layer of the hierarchical format of the display judgment information, and then makes a judgment in the lower layer of the hierarchical format, if certain conditions are satisfied.

Therefore, because of the above-mentioned distinctions it is believed clear that claim 1 and claims 4-8 that depend therefrom would not have been obvious or result from any combination of Humpleman, Beecroft, Choi, Takahashi and Mitra.

Furthermore, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Humpleman, Beecroft, Choi, Takahashi and/or Mitra or elsewhere in the prior art of record which would have caused a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Humpleman, Beecroft, Choi, Takahashi and/or Mitra to obtain the invention of independent claim 1. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1 and claims 4-8 that depend therefrom are clearly allowable over the prior art of record.

Amended independent claim 9 is directed to a method and recites features that correspond to the above-mentioned distinguishing features of independent claim 1. Thus, for the same reasons discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 9 and claims 12-18 that depend therefrom are allowable over the prior art of record.

Regarding dependent claims 4 and 12, which were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Humpleman, Beecroft, Choi, Takahashi and Mitra (main references) in view of Hiroyuki and Castaldi (additional reference), it is respectfully submitted that these additional references do not disclose or suggest the above-discussed features of independent claims 1 and 9 which are lacking from the main references. Therefore, no obvious combination of Hiroyuki and Castaldi with any of the main references would result in, or otherwise render obvious, the invention recited independent claims 1 and 9 and claims 4-8, 12-16 and 18 that depend therefrom.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance and an early notification thereof is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Naonori KATO et al.

/Andrew L. Dunlap/

By 2010.12.14 12:33:58 -05'00'

Andrew L. Dunlap
Registration No. 60,554
Attorney for Applicants

ALD/led
Washington, D.C. 20005-1503
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
December 14, 2010